Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
05-71 MAY 4 2005
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LARRY SYNCLAIR, SR.. - Petitioner

Vs.

COUNTY OF FRESNO, DEPARTMENT OF CHILD ABDUCTION UNIT, DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, and WILLIAM FRANK, RON HOPPER, DENNIS LEWIS, AND EDWARD HUNT, individually - Respondents

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

# PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Larry Synclair
4260 Collins Way
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
(503) 975-2474
Appellant Pro Se

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Does the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bar a federal district court from taking jurisdiction when an administrative decision or a non-judicial document by a local government entity circumvents the Fourteenth Amendment rights of a citizen?

Does the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine apply when an administrative document is used to circumvent a judicial decision?

## LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner: Larry Synclair Sr. (also named herein as Mr. Synclair) is the father of Larry Synclair Jr. and a United States citizen born in Fresno, California.

Respondents: the County of Fresno.

Other Defendants Below: the Child Abduction Unit of the Fresno County District Attorney, William Frank, Dennis Lewis, Ron Hopper, and Edward Hunt.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW..... i

LIST OF PARTIES..... ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iii

OPINIONS BELOW..... 1

JURISDICTION..... 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....6

I. The issue of clarifying the parameters of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine raised in this case is of national importance.....10

A. The doctrine must apply to proceedings only judicial in nature, not administrative.....11

B. The doctrine must apply only if the injury originated from a state court decision..... 13

II. Under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, a District Court should not be barred from jurisdiction when an administrative document is used to circumvent a judicial decision thereby stripping a citizen's 14th Amendment rights of due process?.....14

CONCLUSION..... 17

## INDEX OF APPENDIX

**App. Pages**

Memorandum of the United States Court Of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.....1

Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Denying Petition for Rehearing.....2-3

By the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, its Memorandum Opinion and Order Re Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, filed July 30, 2003.....4-28

For the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, Plaintiff's Statement of Undisputed Facts In Re Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, filed June 20, 2003.....29-33

Order After Hearing by the Superior Court for the State of California, County of San Diego, North County Branch, filed December 20, 2002.....34-45

By the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, its Memorandum Opinion and Order Re Motion To Dismiss First Amended Complaint, filed May 21, 2002.....46-63

For the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint at Law with exhibits, filed March 13, 2002.....64-76

Order After Hearing by the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Fresno, filed January 2, 2002.....77-79

Letter from Fresno County District Attorney Office, Deputy District Attorney Dennis Lewis, dated April 13, 2001.....80-81

Order After Hearing by the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Fresno, filed November, 3, 2000.....82-84

Recommendation of Family Court Counselor and Order Re Child Custody by the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Fresno, filed September 2, 1999.....85-92

Report by Devora Goldberg-Lockton, PhD.....93-95

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Cases Cited:** **Pages:**

*Bell v. City of Milwaukee,* 746 F.2d 1205, 1244 (7th Cir. 1985) .....9

*Betts* v. *Brady*, 316 U.S. 455, 462 (1942).....9

*Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F3d 895, 898-90 (9th Cir. 2003).....7, 11

*Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 635, 6 S.Ct. 524, 535 (1886) .....9

*Carson v. Elrod*, 411 F. Supp. 645, 649 (1976).....9

*County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 845-46, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 1716 (1998).....14

*District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 485 (1983).....7

*Garry v. Geils*, 82 F3d 1362, 1365 (7th Cir., 1996).....12

*Gorzelanczyk v. Baldassone*, 29 Fed. Appx. 402, 403 (7th Cir. 2002).....13

*Gouled v. United States*, 255 U. S. 298, 304, 41 S.Ct. 261, 263 (1921) .....10

*Gross v. State of Illinois*, 312 F 2d 257, 259 (7th Cir. 1963) .....17

*Leaf v. Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin*, 979 F.2d 589, 597 (7th Cir. 1992).....11, 13

*Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 U.S. 1, 26 (1964) .....8

*Moore v. Asheville, North Carolina*,
396 F 3d 385, 392 (4th Cir., 2005).....13

*Powell v Powell*, 80 F.3d 464, 467
(11th Cir. 1996).....15

*Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 301-302,
113 S. Ct. 1439, 1447 (1993) .....8

*Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S.
413 (1923) .....7

*Synclair v. County of Fresno*, 115 Fed. Appx. 395
(9th Cir., 2004) .....1, 7

*Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 719,
117 S.Ct. 2258, 2267 (1997) .....8

*Van Harken v. City of Chicago*, 103 F.3d 1346,
65 USLW 2450 (7th Cir.,1997).....10

**Constitutional Provisions cited:**

Fourteenth Amendment of the United
States Constitution .....1, 8

**Statutes cited:**

California Family Code §3130.....16

California Family Code §3131.....16

California Penal Code 166.4.....2

California Penal Code 273.6.....2

California Penal Code 278.....2

California Penal Code 278.5.....2, 6

California Penal Code 279.....2

28 U.S.C. §1254(1) .....1

42 U.S.C. §1983 .....4

## OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at appendix pg. 2-3 to the petition and is reported at 115 Fed. Appx. 395, 2004 WL 2903630 (9th Cir.(Cal.)). The order of the District Court dismissing the complaint with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction appears at appendix pgs. 4-28 .

## JURIDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1). The date on which the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit decided my case was December 6, 2004, and a copy of the order appears at appendix pg2-3. A timely petition for panel rehearing was denied by the United State courts of appeals on February 4, 2005 and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at appendix pg. 1.

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

This case involves the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, in which it states: "No State shall...deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..."

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The following statement in chronological order clarifies the events that led to the Petitioner's act to file a writ of certiorari. In addition to the events that progressed to the disputed federal court decision, supported by the Ninth Circuit, the following statement will demonstrate how the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine was unsuitably invoked in a federal claim that raised the issue of violations of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution incurred by the purely administrative act of a local government entity.

On September 2, 1999, Judge Jane Cardoza of the Superior Court of California, County of Fresno granted joint custody to Petitioner and his estranged wife Svetlana Synclair, a native and resident of Moscow, Russia. According to the custody order, Mrs. Synclair would be the custodial parent and Mr. Synclair would have visitation rights. The Court added another stipulation that Fresno would enforce and maintain jurisdiction unless a original Moscow custody order was filed in Fresno. Until then, the County of Fresno would enforce the custody order including "failure to obey this order shall be deemed a violation of Sections 166.4, 273.6 278, 278.5, and 279 of the California Penal Code and appropriate law enforcement agencies are directed to secure compliance of this order."